arXiv:1409.4202v1 [math.NA] 15 Sep 2014

NONOVERLAPPING DOMAIN DECOMPOSITION PRECONDITIONERS FOR DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN FINITE ELEMENT METHODS IN H^2-TYPE NORMS

IAIN SMEARS†

Abstract. We analyse the spectral bounds of nonoverlapping domain decomposition preconditioners for *hp*-version discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods in H^2-type norms, which arise in applications to fully nonlinear Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman partial differential equations. We show that for a symmetric model problem, the condition number of the preconditioned system is at most of order $1 + p^6H^3/q^3h^3$, where H and h are respectively the coarse and fine mesh sizes, and q and p are respectively the coarse and fine mesh polynomial degrees. This represents the first result for this class of methods that explicitly accounts for the dependence of the condition number on q, and its sharpness is shown numerically. The key analytical tool is an original optimal order approximation result between fine and coarse discontinuous finite element spaces. We then go beyond the model problem and show computationally that these methods lead to efficient and competitive solvers in practical applications to nonsymmetric, fully nonlinear Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations.

Key words. *hp*-version discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods, domain decomposition, approximation of discontinuous finite element spaces, Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations

AMS subject classifications. 65F10, 65N22, 65N55, 65N30, 35J66

1. Introduction.

Several applications treated by discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods (DGFEM) lead to numerical schemes that are stable in H^2-type norms. A first instance comes from the discretization of the biharmonic equation [9, 14]. Other examples are from [15, 16], where *hp*-version DGFEM were introduced for the numerical solution of linear nondivergence form elliptic equations and fully nonlinear Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations with Cordes coefficients. In these applications, the appropriate norm on the finite element space is a broken H^2-norm with penalization of the jumps in values and in first derivatives across the faces of the mesh. As a result, it is typical for the condition number of the discrete problems to be of order p^8/h^4, where h is the mesh size and p is the polynomial degree. The purpose of this work is to analyse a class of domain decomposition preconditioners and show that they lead to efficient solvers for these challenging problems.

Overlapping and nonoverlapping domain decomposition methods have been successfully developed for a range of applications of DGFEM by many authors [2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12]. In order to solve a problem on a fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$, these methods combine a coarse space solver, defined on a coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$, with local fine mesh solvers, defined on a subdomain decomposition $\mathcal{T}_S$ of the domain Ω. The discontinuous nature of the finite element space leads to a significant flexibility in the choice of the decomposition $\mathcal{T}_S$, which can either be overlapping or nonoverlapping.

As explained in the above references, these methods possess many advantages in terms of simplicity and applicability, as they allow very general choices of basis functions, nonmatching meshes and varying element shapes, and are naturally suited for parallelization. In particular, it has been pointed out by various authors, such as Lasser and Toselli in [12, p. 1235], that the nonoverlapping methods feature reduced inter-subdomain communication burdens, thus representing a key advantage for scalability in parallel computations.

†Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK, smears@maths.ox.ac.uk.

It is of practical interest for applications to determine the influence of the parameters of the preconditioner on the spectral bounds. For problems involving H^1-type norms, such as interior penalty methods for diffusion problems, nonoverlapping additive Schwarz preconditioners for h-version methods [8] lead to condition numbers of order $1+H/h$, and overlapping methods lead to a condition number of order $1+H/\delta$, where H is the coarse mesh size, and δ is the size of the overlap of the subdomains. Antonietti and Houston considered the case of nonoverlapping methods for hp-version DGFEM in [4], and they showed a bound of order $1+p^2H/h$. However, their numerical experiments lead them to conjecture the improved bound of order $1+p^2H/qh$, where q is the coarse space polynomial degree.

For problems involving H^2-type norms, existing results cover only the case of h-version methods. In [9], Feng and Karakashian considered nonoverlapping preconditioners for h-version discretizations of the biharmonic equation, which result in condition numbers of order $1+H^3/h^3$. We also mention the related work by Brenner and Wang in [6] for C^0 interior penalty methods for fourth order problems, where a bound of order $1+H^3/\delta^3$ was derived for an overlapping additive Schwarz method.

As can be seen from the theoretical analysis in the above references, the effectiveness of the preconditioner depends in an essential way on the approximation properties between the coarse and fine spaces. In the analysis of h-version DGFEM, it is sufficient to consider low-order projection operators from the fine space to the coarse space; for example, coarse element mean-value projections are employed in [8] and local first-order elliptic projections are used in [9]. However, low-order projections lead to suboptimal bounds for the condition number in the case of hp-version DGFEM. Therefore, a key contribution of this work is an original high-order approximation result between coarse and fine spaces that is of optimal order in the coarse mesh size and polynomial degree; this result thus represents the main ingredient for the sharp analysis of the condition number bounds.

1.1. Main results. We consider the discontinuous finite element space $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ of degree p over a fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ on a convex polytope $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^d$, $d\in\{2,3\}$, and we equip $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ with the H^2-type norm $\|\cdot\|_{2,h}$ given by

$$\|v_h\|_{2,h}^2=\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|v_h\|_{H^2(K)}^2+|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2,$$
$$|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i}\mu_F\|[\![\nabla v_h\cdot n_F]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2+\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}}\mu_F\|[\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}}\,v_h]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2+\eta_F\|[\![v_h]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2,$$

where $\mu_F\simeq p^2/h$ and $\eta_F\simeq p^6/h^3$. The notation is fully detailed in section 2, and, for simplicity of exposition, we momentarily assume quasiuniformity of the mesh sizes and polynomial degrees; this assumption is relaxed throughout this work. The central original result underpinning our analysis is Theorem 5 of section 3, which shows that for any $v_h\in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, there exists a function $v\in H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|v_h-v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\frac{h}{p}\|v_h-v\|_{H^1(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)}\lesssim\frac{h^2}{p^2}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h},\quad\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\lesssim\|v_h\|_{2,h}.\tag{1.1}$$

Although there does not appear to be any comparable result in the literature, this result is a natural converse to classical direct approximation theory, since, here, the nonsmooth function from the discrete space $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ is approximated by a smoother function from an infinite dimensional space. It can be interpreted as a precise form of the statement that the norm $\|\cdot\|_{2,h}$ renders $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ close to $H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$.

It follows almost immediately that there exists a function v_H in the coarse space $V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$, of polynomials of degree q on $\mathcal{T}_H$, such that

$$\|v_h - v_H\|_{H^k(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \lesssim \frac{H^{2-k}}{q^{2-k}} \|v_h\|_{2,h}, \quad k \in \{0,1,2\}, \tag{1.2}$$

thus yielding an approximation result for $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ by $V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$ that is optimal with respect to both the mesh size and the polynomial degree.

In section 4, we introduce the additive Schwarz nonoverlapping domain decomposition preconditioners for a symmetric positive definite model problem based on the bilinear forms appearing in applications to Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations [16]. The above approximation results are used to show the bound

$$\kappa(\mathbf{P}) \lesssim 1 + \frac{p^2 H}{q\, h} + \frac{p^6\, H^3}{q^3\, h^3}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\kappa(\mathbf{P})$ denotes the condition number of the preconditioned matrix. The first numerical experiment, in section 5.1, confirms that (1.3) is sharp with respect to the orders in the polynomial degrees. In the second experiment of section 5.2, we find that nonoverlapping methods are efficient and competitive with respect to classical overlapping methods. In section 5.3, we show that the preconditioners considered above retain their robustness and efficiency under h-refinement in more challenging applications to nonsymmetric, fully nonlinear Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations, thereby yielding effective solvers for these problems.

2. Definitions. For real numbers a and b, we shall write $a \lesssim b$ to signify that there is a positive constant C such that $a \leq Cb$, where C is independent of the quantities of interest, such as the element sizes and polynomial degrees, but possibly dependent on other quantities, such as the mesh regularity parameters.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2,3\}$, be a bounded convex polytopal domain. Note that convexity of Ω implies that the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω is Lipschitz [11]. Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be a sequence of shape-regular meshes on Ω, consisting of simplices or parallelepipeds. For each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $h_K \coloneqq \operatorname{diam} K$. It is assumed that $h = \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_K$ for each mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$. Let $\mathcal{F}_h^i$ denote the set of interior faces of the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ and let $\mathcal{F}_h^b$ denote the set of boundary faces. The set of all faces of $\mathcal{T}_h$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b} \coloneqq \mathcal{F}_h^i \cup \mathcal{F}_h^b$. Since each element has piecewise flat boundary, the faces may be chosen to be flat.

Mesh conditions. The meshes are allowed to be irregular, i.e. there may be hanging nodes. We assume that there is a uniform upper bound on the number of faces composing the boundary of any given element; in other words, there is a $c_{\mathcal{F}} > 0$, independent of h, such that

$$\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \operatorname{card}\{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b} \colon F \subset \partial K\} \leq c_{\mathcal{F}} \qquad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h. \tag{2.1}$$

It is also assumed that any two elements sharing a face have commensurate diameters, i.e. there is a $c_{\mathcal{T}} \geq 1$, independent of h, such that

$$\max(h_K, h_{K'}) \leq c_{\mathcal{T}} \min(h_K, h_{K'}), \tag{2.2}$$

for any K and K' in $\mathcal{T}_h$ that share a face. For each h, let $\mathbf{p} \coloneqq (p_K \colon K \in \mathcal{T}_h)$ be a vector of positive integers; note that this requires $p_K \geq 1$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. We make the assumption that $\mathbf{p}$ has *local bounded variation*: there is a $c_{\mathcal{P}} \geq 1$, independent of h, such that

$$\max(p_K, p_{K'}) \leq c_{\mathcal{P}} \min(p_K, p_{K'}), \tag{2.3}$$

for any K and K' in $\mathcal{T}_h$ that share a face.

Function spaces. For each $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $\mathcal{P}_{p_K}(K)$ be the space of all real-valued polynomials in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with either total or partial degree at most p_K. In particular, we allow the combination of spaces of polynomials of fixed total degree on some parts of the mesh with spaces of polynomials of fixed partial degree on the remainder. We also allow the use of the space of polynomials of total degree at most p_K even when K is a parallelepiped. The discontinuous Galerkin finite element spaces $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ are defined by

$$V_{h,\mathbf{p}} \coloneqq \left\{ v \in L^2(\Omega) \colon \ v|_K \in \mathcal{P}_{p_K}(K), \ \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Let $\mathbf{s} \coloneqq (s_K \colon K \in \mathcal{T}_h)$ denote a vector of non-negative real numbers. The broken Sobolev space $H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega; \mathcal{T}_h)$ is defined by

$$H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega; \mathcal{T}_h) \coloneqq \left\{ v \in L^2(\Omega) \colon \ v|_K \in H^{s_K}(K), \ \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\}. \tag{2.5}$$

For $s \geq 0$, we set $H^s(\Omega; \mathcal{T}_h) \coloneqq H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega; \mathcal{T}_h)$, where $s_K = s$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. The norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)}$ and semi-norm $|\cdot|_{H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)}$ are defined on $H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega; \mathcal{T}_h)$ as

$$\|v\|_{H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \coloneqq \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|v\|^2_{H^{s_K}(K)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |v|_{H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \coloneqq \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} |v|^2_{H^{s_K}(K)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.6}$$

For a $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, we shall denote its broken gradient by ∇v_h. Sometimes, such as in section 3, it is appropriate to consider ∇v_h as an element of $L^2(\Omega)^d$, even though v_h need not have weak derivatives on Ω.

Jump and average operators. For each face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}$, let $n_F \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote a *fixed* choice of a unit normal vector to F. Since F is flat, n_F is constant over F. Let K be an element of $\mathcal{T}_h$ for which $F \subset \partial K$; then n_F is either inward or outward pointing with respect to K. Let $\tau_F \colon H^s(K) \to H^{s-1/2}(F)$, $s > 1/2$, denote the trace operator from K to F, and let τ_F be extended componentwise to vector-valued functions.

For each face F, define the jump operator $[\![\cdot]\!]$ and the average operator $\{\cdot\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\phi]\!] &\coloneqq \tau_F\left(\phi|_{K_{\text{ext}}}\right) - \tau_F\left(\phi|_{K_{\text{int}}}\right), & \{\phi\} &\coloneqq \tfrac{1}{2}\tau_F\left(\phi|_{K_{\text{ext}}}\right) + \tfrac{1}{2}\tau_F\left(\phi|_{K_{\text{int}}}\right), & &\text{if } F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i, \\ [\![\phi]\!] &\coloneqq \tau_F\left(\phi|_{K_{\text{ext}}}\right), & \{\phi\} &\coloneqq \tau_F\left(\phi|_{K_{\text{ext}}}\right), & &\text{if } F \in \mathcal{F}_h^b, \end{aligned}$$

where ϕ is a sufficiently regular scalar or vector-valued function, and K_{ext} and K_{int} are the elements to which F is a face, i.e. $F = \partial K_{\text{ext}} \cap \partial K_{\text{int}}$. Here, the labelling is chosen so that n_F is outward pointing with respect to K_{ext} and inward pointing with respect to K_{int}. Using this notation, the jump and average of scalar-valued functions, resp. vector-valued, are scalar-valued, resp. vector-valued.

Tangential differential operators. For $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}$, let $H^s_{\text{T}}(F)$ denote the space of H^s-regular tangential vector fields on F, thus $H^s_{\text{T}}(F) \coloneqq \{v \in H^s(F)^d \colon v \cdot n_F = 0 \text{ on } F\}$. We define the tangential gradient $\nabla_{\text{T}} \colon H^s(F) \to H^{s-1}_{\text{T}}(F)$ and the tangential divergence $\operatorname{div}_{\text{T}} \colon H^s_{\text{T}}(F) \to H^{s-1}(F)$, where $s \geq 1$, following [11]. Let $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an orthonormal coordinate system on F. Then, for $u \in H^s(F)$ and $v \in H^s_{\text{T}}(F)$ such that $v = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} v_i \, t_i$, with $v_i \in H^s(F)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d-1$, we define

$$\nabla_{\text{T}} u \coloneqq \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} t_i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t_i}, \qquad \operatorname{div}_{\text{T}} v \coloneqq \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t_i}. \tag{2.7}$$

Mesh-dependent norms. In the following, we let u_h and v_h denote functions in $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$. For face-dependent positive real numbers μ_F and η_F, let the jump stabilization bilinear form $J_h\colon V_{h,\mathbf{p}} \times V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ be defined by

$$J_h(u_h, v_h) \coloneqq \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i} \mu_F \langle [\![\nabla u_h \cdot n_F]\!], [\![\nabla v_h \cdot n_F]\!]\rangle_F + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \big[\mu_F \langle [\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} u_h]\!], [\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v_h]\!]\rangle_F + \eta_F \langle [\![u_h]\!], [\![v_h]\!]\rangle_F\big]. \tag{2.8}$$

Define the jump seminorm $|\cdot|_{\mathrm{J},h}$ and the mesh-dependent norm $\|\cdot\|_{2,h}$ on $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ by

$$|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2 \coloneqq J_h(v_h, v_h), \qquad \|v_h\|_{2,h}^2 \coloneqq \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|v_h\|_{H^2(K)}^2 + |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2. \tag{2.9}$$

For each face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}$, define

$$\tilde{h}_F \coloneqq \begin{cases} \min(h_K, h_{K'}), & \text{if } F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i,\\ h_K, & \text{if } F\in\mathcal{F}_h^b, \end{cases} \qquad \tilde{p}_F \coloneqq \begin{cases} \max(p_K, p_{K'}), & \text{if } F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i,\\ p_K, & \text{if } F\in\mathcal{F}_h^b, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

where K and K' are such that $F = \partial K \cap \partial K'$ if $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i$ or $F \subset \partial K \cap \partial\Omega$ if $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^b$. The assumptions on the mesh and the polynomial degrees, in particular (2.2) and (2.3), show that if F is a face of an element K, then $h_K \le c_{\mathcal{T}}\, \tilde{h}_F$ and $\tilde{p}_F \le c_{\mathcal{P}}\, p_K$. Henceforth, it is assumed that the parameters μ_F and η_F in (2.8) are given by

$$\mu_F \coloneqq c_\mu \frac{\tilde{p}_F^2}{\tilde{h}_F}, \quad \eta_F \coloneqq c_\eta \frac{\tilde{p}_F^6}{\tilde{h}_F^3} \quad \forall\, F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}, \tag{2.11}$$

where c_μ and c_η are fixed positive constants independent of h and $\mathbf{p}$.

Approximation. Under the hypothesis of shape-regularity of $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$, for any function $u \in H^{\mathbf{s}}(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)$, there exists an approximation $\Pi_h u \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, such that for each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\|u - \Pi_h u\|_{H^r(K)} \lesssim \frac{h_K^{\min(s_K,\, p_K+1)-r}}{p_K^{s_K-r}} \|u\|_{H^{s_K}(K)} \quad \forall\, r,\ 0 \le r \le s_K, \tag{2.12a}$$

and, if $s_K > 1/2$,

$$\|D^\alpha (u - \Pi_h u)\|_{L^2(\partial K)} \lesssim \frac{h_K^{\min(s_K,\, p_K+1)-|\alpha|-1/2}}{p_K^{s_K-|\alpha|-1/2}} \|u\|_{H^{s_K}(K)} \quad \forall \alpha,\ |\alpha| \le k, \tag{2.12b}$$

where k is the greatest non-negative integer strictly less than $s_K - 1/2$. The constants in (2.12a) and (2.12b) do not depend on u, K, p_K, h_K or r, but depend possibly on $\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} s_K$. Vector fields can be approximated componentwise.

3. Approximation of discontinuous functions. As explained in section 1, an optimal analysis of the spectral bounds for the class of preconditioners to be considered in section 4 rests upon the optimality of approximation properties between coarse and fine spaces. Therefore, in this section, we first determine how closely a function in $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ can be approximated by functions in $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. This leads to an approximation result for functions in $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ by functions in $V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$ that is of optimal order in both the coarse mesh size and polynomial degree.

3.1. Lifting operators. Let $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^d$ denote the space of d-dimensional vector fields with components in $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$. Let $\mathbf{r}_h\colon L^2(\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}) \to V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^d$ and $r_h\colon L^2(\mathcal{F}_h^i) \to V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ be defined by

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathbf{r}_h(w), \mathbf{v}_h\rangle_K = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \langle w, \{\mathbf{v}_h\cdot n_F\}\rangle_F \qquad \forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^d, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle r_h(w), v_h\rangle_K = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i}} \langle w, \{v_h\}\rangle_F \qquad \forall\, v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}. \tag{3.2}$$

The following result is well-known; for instance, see [4] for a proof.

LEMMA 1. *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain and let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be a shape-regular sequence of meshes satisfying* (2.1), (2.2) *and* (2.3). *Then, the lifting operators satisfy the following bounds:*

$$\|\mathbf{r}_h(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \frac{\tilde{p}_F^2}{\tilde{h}_F}\|w\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \qquad \forall\, w\in L^2(\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}), \tag{3.3a}$$

$$\|r_h(w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i}} \frac{\tilde{p}_F^2}{\tilde{h}_F}\|w\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \qquad \forall\, w\in L^2(\mathcal{F}_h^{i}). \tag{3.3b}$$

For $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ and $\mathbf{v}_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^d$, define $G_h(v_h) \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^d$, $D_h(\mathbf{v}_h) \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ by

$$G_h(v_h) \coloneqq \nabla v_h - \mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket), \tag{3.4a}$$

$$D_h(\mathbf{v}_h) \coloneqq \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}_h - r_h(\llbracket \mathbf{v}_h\cdot n_F\rrbracket). \tag{3.4b}$$

LEMMA 2. *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz polytopal domain, and let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be a shape-regular sequence of meshes satisfying* (2.1), (2.2) *and* (2.3). *Let η_F and μ_F satisfy* (2.11) *for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}$. Then, for any $v_h\in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, we have*

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{p_K^4}{h_K^2}\|\mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \lesssim |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2, \tag{3.5a}$$

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |\mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)|_{H^1(K)}^2 + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i} \mu_F\|\llbracket \mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)\cdot n_F\rrbracket\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \lesssim |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2. \tag{3.5b}$$

Proof. The definition of the lifting operator gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{p_K^4}{h_K^2}\|\mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)\|_{L^2(K)}^2 &= \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \int_F \llbracket v_h\rrbracket \left\{\frac{p^4}{h^2}\mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)\cdot n_F\right\}\mathrm{d}s \\ &\lesssim \left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \frac{\tilde{h}_F^3}{\tilde{p}_F^6}\frac{\tilde{p}_F^8}{\tilde{h}_F^4}\|\mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)\|_{L^2(F)}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}.\end{aligned}$$

The trace and inverse inequalities then yield

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{p_K^4}{h_K^2}\|\mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \lesssim \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{p_K^4}{h_K^2}\|\mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket)\|_{L^2(K)}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h},$$

which implies (3.5a). The bound (3.5b) then follows from (3.5a) as a result of the trace and inverse inequalities. ∎

COROLLARY 3. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 2, every $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ satisfies*

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} |G_h(v_h)|^2_{H^1(K)} + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i} \mu_F \|[\![G_h(v_h)\cdot n_F]\!]\|^2_{L^2(F)} \lesssim \|v_h\|^2_{2,h}. \tag{3.6}$$

We also have $\|D_h(G_h(v_h))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v_h\|_{2,h}$ for every $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$.

Proof. Inequality (3.6) is an easy consequence of the definition of G_h in (3.4a) and of Lemma 2. For $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, write

$$D_h(G_h(v_h)) = \Delta v_h - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{r}_h([\![v_h]\!]) - r_h([\![\nabla v_h \cdot n_F]\!]) + r_h([\![\mathbf{r}_h([\![v_h]\!])\cdot n_F]\!]). \tag{3.7}$$

In view of (3.3b), it is apparent that the L^2-norms of the first and third terms on the right-hand side of (3.7) are bounded by $\|v_h\|_{2,h}$, whilst the bounds on the L^2-norms of the second and fourth terms follow from (3.5b). ∎

3.2. Approximation by H^2-regular functions. The first step towards the aforementioned approximation result is to consider the discrete analogue of the orthogonality of Helmholtz decompositions.

LEMMA 4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2,3\}$, be a bounded Lipschitz polytopal domain, and let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be a shape-regular sequence of meshes satisfying (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). If μ_F and η_F satisfy (2.11) for every face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}$, then, for any $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ and any $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)^{2d-3}$, we have*

$$\left|\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi\,\mathrm{d}x\right| + \left|\int_\Omega \nabla v_h\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K}{p_K^{3/2}} |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. It follows from (3.5a) that $\|\nabla v_h - G_h(v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \max_K h_K/p_K^2 |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}$, so it is enough to show that (3.8) is satisfied by $G_h(v_h)$. Consider momentarily $\psi \in H^2(\Omega)^{2d-3}$; then, integration by parts yields

$$\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi\,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \langle [\![v_h]\!], \{\operatorname{curl}\psi\cdot n_F\}\rangle_F - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathbf{r}_h([\![v_h]\!]), \operatorname{curl}\psi\rangle_K.$$

Therefore, the definitions of the lifting operators $\mathbf{r}_h$ and r_h imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi\,\mathrm{d}x = {}& \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \langle [\![v_h]\!], \{\operatorname{curl}(\psi-\Pi_h\psi)\cdot n_F\}\rangle_F \\ & - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathbf{r}_h([\![v_h]\!]), \operatorname{curl}(\psi-\Pi_h\psi)\rangle_K.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $\psi \in H^2(\Omega)^{2d-3}$, it is seen from the approximation bounds of (2.12) and from the lifting bound (3.5a) that

$$\left|\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^2}{p_K^3} |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\psi\|_{H^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Now, let $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)^{2d-3}$. We apply [1, Thm. 5.33] to the components of ψ: for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\psi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)^{2d-3}$ such that

$$\|\psi-\psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon\|\psi-\psi_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon|\psi|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \tag{3.10a}$$

$$\|\psi_\varepsilon\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \tag{3.10b}$$

where, importantly, the constants in (3.10) do not depend on ε. Define $\phi_\varepsilon \coloneqq \psi - \psi_\varepsilon$, so that

$$\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\phi_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The bounds (3.9) and (3.10b) show that

$$\left|\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\frac{h_K^2}{p_K^3}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{3.11}$$

Integration by parts yields

$$\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\phi_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}}\langle[\![\nabla v_h\times n_F]\!],\phi_\varepsilon\rangle_F - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle\mathbf{r}_h([\![v_h]\!]),\operatorname{curl}\phi_\varepsilon\rangle_K.$$

Lemma 2 and (3.10a) imply that

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}|\langle\mathbf{r}_h([\![v_h]\!]),\operatorname{curl}\phi_\varepsilon\rangle_K| \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\frac{h_K}{p_K^2}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{3.12}$$

Recall the continuous trace inequality [13]: for an element K and a face $F\subset\partial K$,

$$\|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \lesssim |\phi_\varepsilon|_{H^1(K)}\|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(K)} + \frac{1}{h_K}\|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \lesssim \frac{h_K}{p_K^2}|\phi_\varepsilon|_{H^1(K)}^2 + \frac{p_K^2}{h_K}\|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(K)}^2.$$

Therefore, the fact that $\mu_F = c_\mu\,\tilde{p}_F^2/\tilde{h}_F$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}}|\langle[\![\nabla v_h\times n_F]\!],\phi_\varepsilon\rangle_F| &\lesssim \left(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left[\frac{h_K^2}{p_K^4}|\phi_\varepsilon|_{H^1(K)}^2 + \|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(K)}^2\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\\ &\lesssim \left(\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\frac{h_K}{p_K^2}|\phi_\varepsilon|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the identity $|[\![\nabla v_h\times n_F]\!]| = |[\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v_h]\!]|$ for each face F, because $\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v_h$ is the component of ∇v_h that is orthogonal to n_F. Therefore, we deduce from (3.10a) and (3.12) that

$$\left|\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\phi_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \left(\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\frac{h_K}{p_K^2} + \varepsilon\right)|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{3.13}$$

Combining (3.11) and (3.13) yields

$$\left|\int_\Omega G(v_h)\cdot\operatorname{curl}\psi\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \left(\varepsilon^{-1}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\frac{h_K^2}{p_K^3} + \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\frac{h_K}{p_K^2} + \varepsilon\right)|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

The bound (3.8) is then obtained by taking $\varepsilon \coloneqq \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_K/p_K^{3/2}$. ∎

THEOREM 5. *Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^d$, $d\in\{2,3\}$, be a bounded convex polytopal domain, and let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be a shape-regular sequence of meshes satisfying (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). For a given $v_h\in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, let $v_{(h)}\in H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the unique solution of the boundary-value problem*

$$\Delta v_{(h)} = D_h(G_h(v_h)) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{3.14a}$$

$$v_{(h)} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{3.14b}$$

Then, the approximation $v_{(h)}$ to v_h satisfies

$$\|v_h - v_{(h)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K}{p_K}\|v_h - v_{(h)}\|_{H^1(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^2}{p_K^2}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}, \tag{3.15a}$$

$$\|v_{(h)}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v_h\|_{2,h}. \tag{3.15b}$$

REMARK 1. *The above result is nearly optimal in the sense that only the jump seminorm $|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}$ appears on the right-hand side of the error bound* (3.15a)*, and that the correct orders of convergence are established.*

Proof. Note that convexity of Ω implies that $v_{(h)}$ is well-defined, see [11], and that (3.15b) holds as a result of Corollary 3. First, we show that for any $p \in H^k(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, $k \in \{1,2\}$, we have

$$\left|\int_\Omega \big(\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\big)\cdot\nabla p\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^k}{p_K^k}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|p\|_{H^k(\Omega)}. \tag{3.16}$$

Indeed, since $v_{(h)}$ solves (3.14), integration by parts yields

$$\int_\Omega \big(\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\big)\cdot\nabla p\,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle r_h(\llbracket G_h(v_h)\cdot n_F\rrbracket), p\rangle_K - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i} \langle \llbracket G_h(v_h)\cdot n_F\rrbracket, \{p\}\rangle_F.$$

Then, the definition of the lifting operator gives

$$\int_\Omega \big(\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\big)\cdot\nabla p\,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle r_h(\llbracket G_h(v_h)\cdot n_F\rrbracket), p-\Pi_h p\rangle_K - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i} \langle \llbracket G_h(v_h)\cdot n_F\rrbracket, \{p-\Pi_h p\}\rangle_F. \tag{3.17}$$

Recalling that $p_K \geq 1$ for each element K, it is then seen that (3.16) follows from Corollary 3 and from the approximation bounds (2.12).

The remainder of the proof makes use of Helmholtz decompositions of vector fields [10]: for any $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^d$, there exists $p \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)^{2d-3}$, such that $\mathbf{v} = \nabla p + \operatorname{curl}\psi$ in Ω. Indeed, $p \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$\int_\Omega \nabla p\cdot\nabla q\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla q\,\mathrm{d}x \qquad \forall\, q \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Then, $\mathbf{v}-\nabla p$ is divergence free, thus $\langle(\mathbf{v}-\nabla p)\cdot\mathbf{n}, 1\rangle_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, where $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit outward normal on $\partial\Omega$. Since the convex domain Ω has a connected boundary, it follows from [10, Thms. 3.1 & 3.4 pp. 37–45] that there exists a $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)^{2d-3}$ such that $\mathbf{v} = \nabla p + \operatorname{curl}\psi$. Moreover, ψ may be chosen so that $\|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for some constant independent of $\mathbf{v}$. This is a consequence of the Open Mapping Theorem and the facts that $\mathcal{V} \coloneqq \{\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^d\colon \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v} = 0\}$ is a closed subspace of $L^2(\Omega)^d$, and that the mapping $\psi \mapsto \operatorname{curl}\psi$ is a surjective bounded linear mapping from $H^1(\Omega)^{2d-3}$ to $\mathcal{V}$.

Now, observe that $\|\nabla v_h - G_h(v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_K/p_K^2\,|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}$ by (3.5a), so it is enough to consider the error between $G_h(v_h)$ and $\nabla v_{(h)}$ to bound $|v_h - v_{(h)}|_{H^1(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)}$.

Let $p \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)^{2d-3}$ satisfy $\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h) = \nabla p + \operatorname{curl}\psi$, with $\|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Then, noting that $\nabla v_{(h)}$ and $\operatorname{curl}\psi$ are orthogonal, it is deduced that

$$\|\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = \int_\Omega \big(\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\big)\cdot \nabla p \,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega G_h(v_h)\cdot \operatorname{curl}\psi \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.18}$$

Inequality (3.16) and the bound $\|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ give

$$\left|\int_\Omega \big(\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\big)\cdot \nabla p \,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K}{p_K}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

The bounds of Lemma 4 show that

$$\left|\int_\Omega G_h(v_h)\cdot \operatorname{curl}\psi \,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K}{p_K^{3/2}}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore, equation (3.18) and the above bounds yield

$$\|\nabla v_{(h)} - G_h(v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K}{p_K}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}. \tag{3.19}$$

We now consider the error $\|v_h - v_{(h)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Since Ω is convex, there is a unique $z \in H^2(\Omega)\cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ that solves $-\Delta z = v_h - v_{(h)}$ in Ω, with $\|z\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v_h - v_{(h)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Then, it is found that

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_h - v_{(h)}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = \int_\Omega \big(G_h(v_h) - \nabla v_{(h)}\big)\cdot \nabla z \,\mathrm{d}x \\ + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h \rrbracket), \nabla z\rangle_K - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \langle \llbracket v_h\rrbracket, \{\nabla z\cdot n_F\}\rangle_F.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the bound (3.16) to $z \in H^2(\Omega)\cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ gives

$$\left|\int_\Omega \big(G_h(v_h) - \nabla v_{(h)}\big)\cdot \nabla z \,\mathrm{d}x\right| \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^2}{p_K^2}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|v_h - v_{(h)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Also, it is found that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket), \nabla z\rangle_K - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \langle \llbracket v_h\rrbracket, \{\nabla z\cdot n_F\}\rangle_F \\ &\qquad = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathbf{r}_h(\llbracket v_h\rrbracket), \nabla (z - \Pi_h z)\rangle_K - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \langle \llbracket v_h\rrbracket, \{\nabla (z-\Pi_h z)\cdot n_F\}\rangle_F,\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by $\max_K h_K^2/p_K^3 |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}\|v_h - v_{(h)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Thus, we have shown that

$$\|v_h - v_{(h)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K^2}{p_K^2}|v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}. \tag{3.20}$$

The bounds (3.19) and (3.20) imply (3.15a). ∎

3.3. Approximation by coarse grid functions. Theorem 5 leads to the following result about the approximability of the fine space $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ with respect to the coarse space $V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$.

THEOREM 6. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2,3\}$, be a bounded convex polytopal domain, and let $\{\mathcal{T}_H\}_H$ and $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be nested shape-regular sequences of meshes satisfying* (2.1), (2.2) *and* (2.3). *Then, for any $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, there exists a $v_H \in V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$, such that*

$$\|v_h - v_H\|_{H^k(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \lesssim \left(\max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_D}{q_D}\right)^{2-k} \|v_h\|_{2,h}, \qquad k \in \{0,1,2\}. \tag{3.21a}$$

$$\|v_H\|_{2,h}^2 \lesssim \left(1 + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{H_D}{q_D}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^2}{h_K} + \frac{H_D^3}{q_D^3}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^6}{h_K^3}\right]\right)\|v_h\|_{2,h}^2. \tag{3.21b}$$

Proof. Let $v_{(h)} \in H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the approximation to v_h considered in Theorem 5. Let $v_H \in V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$ be the projection $\Pi_H v_{(h)}$. Since $\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_K/p_K \le \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} H_D/q_D$, it is seen that (3.21a) follows easily from the triangle inequality in conjunction with (3.15b) and the approximation properties of v_H. In particular, note that it follows from $v_H = \Pi_H v_{(h)}$ that $\|v_H\|_{H^2(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \lesssim \|v_{(h)}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$, and since Theorem 5 implies that $\|v_{(h)}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v_h\|_{2,h}$, we obtain $\|v_H\|_{H^2(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \lesssim \|v_h\|_{2,h}$.

It remains to show (3.21b) by bounding the jump seminorm of v_H as follows. If the face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i(D)$ for $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$, then the jumps of v_H and its first derivatives vanish because v_H is a polynomial over D. Since $v_{(h)} \in H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, $[\![v_H]\!] = [\![v_H - v_{(h)}]\!]$ and $[\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v_H]\!] = [\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}}(v_H - v_{(h)})]\!]$ for each face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}(\partial D)$, whilst $[\![\nabla v_H \cdot n_F]\!] = [\![\nabla(v_H - v_{(h)})\cdot n_F]\!]$ for each face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i(\partial D)$. Therefore, it is deduced from the mesh assumptions on $\mathcal{T}_h$ and $\mathcal{T}_H$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \eta_F \|[\![v_H]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2 &\le \sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}(\partial D)} \eta_F \|[\![v_H - v_{(h)}]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^6}{h_K^3}\|v_H - v_{(h)}\|_{L^2(\partial D)}^2 \lesssim \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{H_D^3}{q_D^3}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^6}{h_K^3}\right]\|v_{(h)}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Similar bounds also yield

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \mu_F \|[\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v_H]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2 + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i} \mu_F \|[\![\nabla v_H \cdot n_F]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \\ \lesssim \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{H_D}{q_D}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^2}{h_K}\right]\|v_{(h)}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|v_{(h)}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v_h\|_{2,h}$, the proof of (3.21b) is complete. ∎

Previous results on the approximation of fine mesh functions by coarse mesh functions typically involved lower-order projection operators, which were therefore suboptimal in terms of q in bounds such as (3.21a). The original result of an approximation with optimal orders in both H and q of Theorem 6 will lead to a sharp analysis of the nonoverlapping domain decomposition preconditioners in the next section.

4. Domain decomposition preconditioners. As explained in the introduction, we are interested in developing efficient solvers for DGFEM for Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equations, which were first proposed by this author and Süli in [16].

In order to explain the choice of preconditioners, it is helpful to recall the essential parts of the numerical scheme developed there. The problems considered in [16] are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} [L^\alpha u - f^\alpha] = 0 \quad &\text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \quad &\text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where Ω is a convex domain, Λ is a compact metric space, and the operators L^α are given by

$$L^\alpha v \coloneqq a^\alpha \colon D^2 v + b^\alpha \cdot \nabla v - c^\alpha v, \quad v \in H^2(\Omega),\ \alpha \in \Lambda. \tag{4.2}$$

For simplicity of presentation here, we restrict our attention to the case $b^\alpha \equiv 0$, $c^\alpha \equiv 0$, and refer the reader to [16] for the general case.

The problem is fully nonlinear in the sense that the Hessian of the unknown solution appears inside the nonlinear term in (4.1). As a result of the nonlinearity, no weak form of the equation is available: this has constituted a long-standing difficulty in the development of high-order methods for this class of problems.

Provided that the coefficients of L^α satisfy the Cordes condition, which, in the case of pure diffusion, requires that there exist $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ such that

$$\frac{|a^\alpha(x)|^2}{\left(\operatorname{Tr} a^\alpha(x)\right)^2} \leq \frac{1}{d-1+\varepsilon} \quad \forall\, \alpha \in \Lambda,\ \forall\, x \in \Omega. \tag{4.3}$$

then the boundary-value problem (4.1) has a unique solution in $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. Furthermore, the solution can be approximated by a stable, convergent high-order DGFEM, see [16]. Observe that for problems in two spatial dimensions, condition (4.3) is equivalent to uniform ellipticity.

Defining the operator $F_\gamma[u] \coloneqq \sup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} [\gamma^\alpha (L^\alpha u - f^\alpha)]$, where $\gamma^\alpha = \operatorname{Tr} a^\alpha / |a^\alpha|^2$, the numerical scheme of [16] for solving (4.1) associated to a homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition is to find $u_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ such that

$$A_h(u_h; v_h) = 0 \quad \forall\, v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}, \tag{4.4}$$

where the nonlinear form A_h is defined in [16, Eq. (5.3)], and can be equivalently expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} A_h(u_h; v_h) \coloneqq &\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle F_\gamma[u_h], \Delta v_h \rangle_K \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\left(a_h(u_h, v_h) - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \Delta u_h, \Delta v_h \rangle_K + J_h(u_h, v_h) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where the bilinear form $a_h \colon V_{h,\mathbf{p}} \times V_{h,\mathbf{p}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(u_h, v_h) \coloneqq &\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle D^2 u_h, D^2 v_h \rangle_K + J_h(u_h, v_h) \\ &+ \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i} \left[\langle \operatorname{div}_{\mathrm{T}} \nabla_{\mathrm{T}} \{u_h\}, [\![\nabla v_h \cdot n_F]\!] \rangle_F + \langle \operatorname{div}_{\mathrm{T}} \nabla_{\mathrm{T}} \{v_h\}, [\![\nabla u_h \cdot n_F]\!] \rangle_F \right] \\ &- \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \left[\langle \nabla_{\mathrm{T}} \{\nabla u_h \cdot n_F\}, [\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v]\!] \rangle_F + \langle \nabla_{\mathrm{T}} \{\nabla v_h \cdot n_F\}, [\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v_h]\!] \rangle_F \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Although our current presentation of the scheme for HJB equations is necessarily brief, we refer the reader to [15, 16] for a complete derivation and analysis of the scheme, including proof of its consistency, stability and error bounds.

The nonlinear problem (4.4) can be solved by the semismooth Newton method detailed in [16, Section 8], which leads to nonsymmetric but positive definite linear system to be solved at each step. The analysis of stability of the scheme in [16] shows that these linear systems owe their positive definiteness to the leading terms of a_h. This constitutes our motivation for developing preconditioners based on a_h.

4.1. Model problem. In the remainder of this section, we consider the model problem of finding $u_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ such that

$$a_h(u_h, v_h) = \ell_h(v_h) \qquad \forall\, v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\ell_h \colon V_{h,\mathbf{p}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded linear functional on $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$. The resulting preconditioners based on a_h are applied to HJB equations in the experiments of section 5. In the following result, we show that (4.7) is well-posed by coercivity of a_h.

LEMMA 7. *Let Ω be a bounded convex polytopal domain and let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be a shape-regular sequence of meshes satisfying* (2.1)*. Then, there exist positive constants $\underline{c}_\mu$ and $\underline{c}_\eta$ such that*

$$\|v_h\|_{2,h}^2 \lesssim a_h(v_h, v_h), \quad |a_h(v_h, w_h)| \lesssim \|v_h\|_{2,h}\|w_h\|_{h,2} \quad \forall\, v_h,\, w_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}, \tag{4.8}$$

whenever $c_\mu \geq \underline{c}_\mu$ and $c_\eta \geq \underline{c}_\eta$.

Proof. The continuity bound in (4.8) is a straightforward consequence of the trace and inverse inequalities. To show the coercivity bound, we first show that

$$\|v_h\|_{2,h}^2 \lesssim \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|D^2 v_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2 =: |v_h|_{h,2}^2. \tag{4.9}$$

For any $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla v_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2 = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle v_h, -\Delta v_h\rangle_K + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \langle [\![v_h]\!], \{\nabla v_h \cdot n_F\}\rangle_F \\ + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i}} \langle \{v_h\}, [\![\nabla v_h \cdot n_F]\!]\rangle_F.\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Hence, the trace and inverse inequalities imply that

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla v_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \lesssim \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}|v_h|_{h,2}. \tag{4.11}$$

We recall the broken Poincaré inequality

$$\|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla v_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}} \frac{1}{\tilde{h}_F} \|[\![v_h]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2. \tag{4.12}$$

Therefore it follows from (4.11) that we have $\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|v_h\|_{H^1(K)}^2 \lesssim |v_h|_{h,2}^2$, from which we deduce (4.9). The proof of (4.8) is now completed by noting that [15, Lemma 7] implies that there exist $\underline{c}_\mu$ and $\underline{c}_\eta$ such that $|v_h|_{h,2}^2 \lesssim a_h(v_h, v_h)$, whenever $c_\mu \geq \underline{c}_\mu$ and $c_\eta \geq \underline{c}_\eta$. ∎

The condition number of the linear system of (4.7) depends on the choice of basis for $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$. However, in practice, the basis is often chosen to be either a nodal basis or a mapped orthonormal basis. For example, let us assume that each basis function ϕ_i of $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ has support in only one element, and is mapped from a member of a set of functions that are L^2-orthonormal on a reference element. Then, arguments that are similar to those in [4] show that the ℓ^2-norm condition number $\kappa(\mathbf{A})$ of the matrix $\mathbf{A} \coloneqq (a_h(\phi_i, \phi_j))$ satisfies

$$\kappa(\mathbf{A}) \lesssim \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{p_K^8}{h_K^4} \frac{\max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^d}{\min_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K^d}, \tag{4.13}$$

where it is recalled that d is the dimension of the domain Ω.

4.2. Domain decomposition. Let Ω be partitioned into a set $\mathcal{T}_S \coloneqq \{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ of nonoverlapping Lipschitz polytopal subdomains Ω_i. The partition $\mathcal{T}_S$ is assumed to be conforming. A coarse simplicial or parallelepipedal mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ is associated to each fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$. Let $H_D \coloneqq \operatorname{diam} D$ for each $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and suppose that $H \coloneqq \max_{D \in \mathcal{T}_H} H_D$. It is required that the sequence of meshes $\{\mathcal{T}_H\}_H$ satisfy the mesh conditions of section 2. Furthermore, the partitions $\mathcal{T}_S$, $\mathcal{T}_H$ and $\mathcal{T}_h$ are assumed to be *nested*, in the sense that no face of $\mathcal{T}_S$, respectively $\mathcal{T}_H$, cuts the interior of an element of $\mathcal{T}_H$, respectively $\mathcal{T}_h$. Hence, each element $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$ satisfies $\overline{D} = \bigcup \overline{K}$, where the union is over all elements $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ such that $K \subset D$.

For each mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$, let $\mathbf{q} \coloneqq (q_D \colon D \in \mathcal{T}_H)$ be a vector of *positive* integers; so $q_D \geq 1$ for each element $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$. Assume that $\mathbf{q}$ satisfies the bounded variation property of (2.3), and that $q_D \leq \min_{K \subset D} p_K$ for all $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$. For each $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$, define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_h(D) &\coloneqq \{K \in \mathcal{T}_h \colon K \subset D\}, & \mathcal{F}_h^i(D) &\coloneqq \left\{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i \colon F \subset D\right\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_h^i(\partial D) &\coloneqq \left\{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i \colon F \subset \partial D\right\}, & \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}(\partial D) &\coloneqq \{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b} \colon F \subset \partial D\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Although the sets $\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)$ and $\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}(D)$ are not disjoint, the above assumptions on the meshes imply that $\mathcal{F}_h^{i,b} = \bigcup_D \mathcal{F}_h^i(D) \cup \mathcal{F}_h^{i,b}(\partial D)$ and that $\mathcal{F}_h^i = \bigcup_D \mathcal{F}_h^i(D) \cup \mathcal{F}_h^i(\partial D)$. Define the function spaces

$$V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i \coloneqq \left\{v \in L^2(\Omega_i) \colon\ v|_K \in \mathcal{P}_{p_K}(K) \quad \forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h, K \subset \Omega_i\right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, \tag{4.15a}$$

$$V_{H,\mathbf{q}} \coloneqq \left\{v \in L^2(\Omega) \colon\ v|_D \in \mathcal{P}_{q_D}(D) \quad \forall\, D \in \mathcal{T}_H\right\}. \tag{4.15b}$$

For convenience of notation, let $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^0 \coloneqq V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$. It follows from the above conditions on the meshes that every function $v_H \in V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$ also belongs to $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, so let $I_0 \colon V_{H,\mathbf{q}} \to V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ denote the natural imbedding map. For $1 \leq i \leq N$, let $I_i \colon V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i \to V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ denote the natural injection operator defined by

$$I_i\, v_i \coloneqq \begin{cases} v_i & \text{on } \Omega_i, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Omega - \Omega_i, \end{cases} \qquad \forall\, v_i \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i. \tag{4.16}$$

Then, any function $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ can be decomposed as $v_h = \sum_{i=1}^N I_i \left(v_h|_{\Omega_i}\right)$. Let the bilinear forms $a_h^i \colon V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i \times V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i \to \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq i \leq N$, be defined by

$$a_h^i(u_i, v_i) \coloneqq a_h(I_i\, u_i, I_i\, v_i) \qquad \forall\, u_i, v_i \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i. \tag{4.17}$$

It is clear that the bilinear forms a_h^i are symmetric and coercive on $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i \times V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i$.

For $0 \le i \le N$, let the projection operator $\tilde{P}_i \colon V_{h,\mathbf{p}} \to V^i_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ be defined by

$$a^i_h(\tilde{P}_i\, v_h, v_i) = a_h(v_h, I_i\, v_i) \qquad \forall\, v_i \in V^i_{h,\mathbf{p}},\ \forall\, v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}. \tag{4.18}$$

Then, set $P_i \coloneqq I_i\, \tilde{P}_i \colon V_{h,\mathbf{p}} \to V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$. If $\mathbf{A}_i$ denotes the matrix that corresponds to the bilinear form a^i_h and if $\mathbf{I}_i$ denotes the matrix corresponding to the injection operator I_i, then $\mathbf{P}_i$, the matrix representing P_i, can be written as $\mathbf{P}_i = \mathbf{I}_i\, \mathbf{A}_i^{-1}\, \mathbf{I}_i^{\top}\, \mathbf{A}$. The additive Schwarz operator P is defined as

$$P \coloneqq \sum_{i=0}^{N} P_i. \tag{4.19}$$

The matrix of the preconditioned system is $\mathbf{P} \coloneqq \sum_{i=0}^{N} \mathbf{P}_i$. The operator P leads to a symmetric preconditioner that may be employed in the preconditioned conjugate gradient method [7]. Further preconditioners, such as multiplicative, symmetric multiplicative and hybrid methods, are presented in [17, 18] and the references therein. The general theory of Schwarz methods [17, 18] simplifies the analysis of the preconditioners described above to the verification of three key properties.

PROPERTY 1. *Suppose that there exists a constant c_0 such that each $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ admits a decomposition $v_h = \sum_{i=0}^{N} I_i\, v_i$, with $v_i \in V^i_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, for each $0 \le i \le N$, with*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N} a^i_h(v_i, v_i) \le c_0\, a_h(v_h, v_h). \tag{4.20}$$

PROPERTY 2. *Assume that there exist constants $\varepsilon_{ij} \in [0,1]$, such that*

$$|a_h(I_i\, v_i, I_j v_j)| \le \varepsilon_{ij} \sqrt{a_h(I_i\, v_i, I_i\, v_i)\; a_h(I_j\, v_j, I_j\, v_j)}, \tag{4.21}$$

for all $v_i \in V^i_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ and all $v_j \in V^j_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, $1 \le i, j \le N$. Let $\rho(\mathcal{E})$ denote the spectral radius of the matrix $\mathcal{E} \coloneqq (\varepsilon_{ij})$.

PROPERTY 3. *Suppose that there exists a constant $\omega \in (0,2)$, such that*

$$a_h(I_i\, v_i, I_i\, v_i) \le \omega\, a^i_h(v_i, v_i) \quad \forall\, v_i \in V^i_{h,\mathbf{p}},\ 0 \le i \le N. \tag{4.22}$$

Properties 1–3 are sometimes referred to respectively as the stable decomposition property, the strengthened Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and local stability. The following theorem from the theory of Schwarz methods is quoted from [18].

THEOREM 8. *If Properties 1–3 hold, then the condition number $\kappa(\mathbf{P})$ of the additive Schwarz operator P satisfies*

$$\kappa(\mathbf{P}) \le c_0\, \omega\, (\rho(\mathcal{E}) + 1). \tag{4.23}$$

REMARK 2. *With the above choices of bilinear forms a^i_h and with the arguments presented in* [4]*, it is seen that* (4.22) *holds in fact with equality for $\omega = 1$. Also, in* (4.21)*, we can take $\varepsilon_{ij} = 1$ if $\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_j \neq \emptyset$, and $\varepsilon_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Therefore, as explained in* [4]*, $\rho(\mathcal{E}) \le N_c + 1$, where N_c is the maximum number of adjacent subdomains that a given subdomain might have. Therefore, Properties 2 and 3 hold, and it remains to verify Property 1.*

The following theorem determines a bound on the constant appearing in (4.20), which can be used in conjunction with Theorem 8 to analyse the properties of the preconditioners. The proof of this result is given in the next section.

THEOREM 9. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2,3\}$, be a bounded convex polytopal domain, and let $\mathcal{T}_S$, $\{\mathcal{T}_H\}_H$ and $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be successively nested shape-regular sequences of meshes, with $\mathcal{T}_S$ conforming, and $\{\mathcal{T}_H\}_H$ and $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ satisfying (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). Let μ_F and η_F satisfy (2.11) for each face F, with c_μ and c_η chosen to satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 7. Then, each $v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ admits a decomposition $v_h = \sum_{i=0}^N I_i\, v_i$, with $v_i \in V^i_{h,\mathbf{p}}$, $0 \leq i \leq N$, such that*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N} a_h^i(v_i, v_i) \lesssim \tilde{c}_0\, a_h(v_h, v_h), \tag{4.24}$$

where the constant $\tilde{c}_0$ is given by

$$\tilde{c}_0 \coloneqq 1 + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{q_D}{H_D}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^2}{h_K}\right]\max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\frac{H_D^2}{q_D^2} + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{q_D}{H_D}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^6}{h_K^3}\right]\max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\frac{H_D^4}{q_D^4}. \tag{4.25}$$

It follows from Theorems 8 and 9 that the condition number of $\mathbf{P}$ satisfies

$$\kappa\left(\mathbf{P}\right) \lesssim \tilde{c}_0\left(N_c + 2\right), \tag{4.26}$$

where $\tilde{c}_0$ is as above, and N_c is the maximum number of adjacent subdomains that a given subdomain from $\mathcal{T}_S$ might have. If the sequence of coarse spaces $\{V_{H,\mathbf{q}}\}_H$ satisfy the assumption that $H_D/q_D \lesssim \min_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} H_D/q_D$ for all $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$, then the constant $\tilde{c}_0$ in the above proposition simplifies to

$$\tilde{c}_0 \simeq 1 + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{H_D}{q_D}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^2}{h_K} + \frac{H_D^3}{q_D^3}\max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\frac{p_K^6}{h_K^3}\right]. \tag{4.27}$$

Moreover, if the sequences of meshes $\{\mathcal{T}_H\}_H$ and $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ are quasiuniform, and if the polynomial degrees are also quasiuniform in the sense that $q \coloneqq \max_D q_D \lesssim q_D$ for all $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and $p \coloneqq \max_K p_K \lesssim p_K$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, then the condition number of the preconditioned matrix $\mathbf{P}$ satisfies the bound

$$\kappa\left(\mathbf{P}\right) \lesssim \left(N_c + 2\right)\left(1 + \frac{p^2\, H}{q\, h} + \frac{p^6\, H^3}{q^3\, h^3}\right). \tag{4.28}$$

It is well-known that the above bound is optimal in terms of the powers of H and h, see [6, 9]. The numerical experiments of section 5 show that the bound (4.28) is also sharp in terms of the orders of p and q. Choosing the coarse space such that $H \simeq h$ and $q \simeq p$ implies that $\kappa(\mathbf{P}) \lesssim p^3$, which shows that the preconditioner is not robust with respect to p, yet constitutes nonetheless a significant improvement over the condition number of order p^8/h^4 for the unpreconditioned matrix.

4.3. Stable decomposition property. The following lemma, due to Feng and Karakashian in [8], provides a trace inequality for the boundaries ∂D of elements $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$. However, the inequality is not written there in the form that is required

for our purposes. So, we present again the proof, with some variations from the arguments in [8].

LEMMA 10. *Let $\{\mathcal{T}_H\}_H$ and $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ be shape-regular sequences of nested simplicial or parallelepipedal meshes satisfying the conditions* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*, and let* $\mathbf{p}$ *satisfy* (2.3)*. Let $v \in L^2(D)$ belong to $\mathcal{P}_{p_K}(K)$ for each $K \subset D$. Then, we have*

$$\|v\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)} \lesssim \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} |v|_{H^1(K)}\|v\|_{L^2(K)} + \frac{1}{H_D}\|v\|^2_{L^2(D)} + \left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \frac{\tilde{p}_F^2}{\tilde{h}_F}\|[\![v]\!]\|^2_{L^2(F)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^2(D)}. \tag{4.29}$$

Proof. As shown in [8], since each element $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$ is an affine image of a convex reference element, it follows that there is a point $x_0 \in D$, such that $(x-x_0)\cdot n_{\partial D} \gtrsim H_D$ for each $x \in \partial D$, where $n_{\partial D}$ is the unit outward normal vector to ∂D. Therefore,

$$\|v\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)} \lesssim \frac{1}{H_D}\int_{\partial D} |v|^2\,(x-x_0)\cdot n_{\partial D}\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{4.30}$$

Integration by parts shows that

$$\int_{\partial D} |v|^2\,(x-x_0)\cdot n_{\partial D}\,\mathrm{d}s = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)}\int_K \left[\operatorname{div}(x-x_0)\,|v|^2 + 2v\,\nabla v\cdot(x-x_0)\right]\mathrm{d}x - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \langle [\![v^2]\!], \{(x-x_0)\cdot n_F\}\rangle_F.$$

Since $[\![v^2]\!] = 2[\![v]\!]\,\{v\}$, it is found that

$$\int_{\partial D} |v|^2\,(x-x_0)\cdot n_{\partial D}\,\mathrm{d}s \lesssim H_D \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} |v|_{H^1(K)}\|v\|_{L^2(K)} + \|v\|^2_{L^2(D)} + H_D\left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \frac{\tilde{p}_F^2}{\tilde{h}_F}\|[\![v]\!]\|^2_{L^2(F)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \frac{\tilde{h}_F}{\tilde{p}_F^2}\|\{v\}\|^2_{L^2(F)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The inverse and trace inequalities imply that

$$\left(\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \frac{\tilde{h}_F}{\tilde{p}_F^2}\|\{v\}\|^2_{L^2(F)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \|v\|_{L^2(D)}.$$

Therefore, (4.29) follows from (4.30) and the above bounds. ∎

Equipped with the approximation result of Theorem 6, it is now possible to prove Theorem 9 using a similar approach to [4, 8, 9].

Proof of Theorem 9. Let v_H be given as in Theorem 6, set $v_0 \coloneqq v_H$, and denote by $v_i \in V^i_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ the restriction of $v_h - v_H$ to Ω_i, $1 \le i \le N$; hence $v_h = \sum_{i=0}^N I_i v_i$. Then, we write

$$\sum_{i=0}^N a_h^i(v_i,v_i) = a_h(v_H,v_H) + a_h(v_h-v_H, v_h-v_H) - \sum_{\substack{i,\,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^N a_h(I_iv_i, I_jv_j). \tag{4.31}$$

Observe that the constant appearing on the right-hand side of (3.21b) can be bounded in terms of $\tilde{c}_0$, which was defined in (4.25). So, Theorem 6 and Lemma 7 imply

$$a_h(v_H, v_H) \lesssim \|v_H\|_{2,h}^2 \lesssim \tilde{c}_0\, a_h(v_h, v_h), \tag{4.32a}$$

$$a_h(v_h - v_H, v_h - v_H) \lesssim \|v_h\|_{2,h}^2 + \|v_H\|_{2,h}^2 \lesssim \tilde{c}_0\, a_h(v_h, v_h). \tag{4.32b}$$

It remains to bound the last term in (4.31), which concerns the interface flux and jump terms at the boundaries of the subdomains of $\mathcal{T}_S$. Expanding this term and using the triangle inequality leads to

$$\sum_{\substack{i,\,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} |a_h(I_i v_i, I_j v_j)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{5} E_k, \tag{4.33}$$

where the quantities E_k are defined by

$$E_1 \coloneqq \sum_{\substack{i,\,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} \eta_F\, |\langle (v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_i}\,,\, (v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_j}\rangle_F|, \tag{4.34a}$$

$$E_2 \coloneqq \sum_{\substack{i,\,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} \mu_F\, |\langle \nabla_{\mathrm{T}}(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_i}\,,\, \nabla_{\mathrm{T}}(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_j}\rangle_F|, \tag{4.34b}$$

$$E_3 \coloneqq \sum_{\substack{i,\,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} \mu_F\, |\langle \nabla(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_i}\cdot n_F,\, \nabla(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_j}\cdot n_F\rangle_F|, \tag{4.34c}$$

$$E_4 \coloneqq \sum_{\substack{i,\,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} |\langle \mathrm{div}_{\mathrm{T}}\, \nabla_{\mathrm{T}}\, (v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_i}\,,\, \nabla(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_j}\cdot n_F\rangle_F|, \tag{4.34d}$$

$$E_5 \coloneqq \sum_{\substack{i,\,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} |\langle \nabla_{\mathrm{T}}(\nabla(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_i}\cdot n_F),\, \nabla_{\mathrm{T}}(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_j}\rangle_F|. \tag{4.34e}$$

Note that in (4.34), we have made use of the symmetry of the sum over i, j, $i \neq j$, and the fact that any face $F \subset \partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_j$ must be an interior face.

Defining $\eta_D \coloneqq \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} p_K^6/h_K^3$ for each $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$, the hypotheses (2.2) and (2.3) and the nestedness of the meshes imply that

$$E_1 \lesssim \sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \eta_D \|v_h - v_H\|_{L^2(\partial D)}^2.$$

Therefore, using the trace inequality of Lemma 10, we find that

$$E_1 \lesssim \sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \eta_D \left[\frac{H_D}{q_D} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} |v_h - v_H|_{H^1(K)}^2 + \frac{H_D}{q_D} \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \frac{\tilde{p}_F^2}{\tilde{h}_F} \|[\![v_h]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{q_D}{H_D} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} \|v_h - v_H\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \right].$$

Notice that the jumps $[\![v_H]\!]$ vanish for faces $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i(D)$. Therefore, the approximation bound of Theorem 6 gives

$$E_1 \lesssim \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\eta_D \frac{H_D}{q_D}\right] \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_D^2}{q_D^2}\|v_h\|_{2,h}^2 + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\eta_D \frac{H_D}{q_D} \max_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \frac{\tilde{h}_F^2}{\tilde{p}_F^4}\right] |v_h|_{\mathrm{J},h}^2 + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\eta_D \frac{q_D}{H_D}\right] \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_D^4}{q_D^4}\|v_h\|_{2,h}^2, \tag{4.35}$$

and thus it follows from (2.2) and (2.3) and coercivity of a_h that

$$E_1 \lesssim \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{q_D}{H_D} \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} \frac{p_K^6}{h_K^3}\right] \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_D^4}{q_D^4}\, a_h(v_h, v_h). \tag{4.36}$$

Remark that we have used the bounds $H_D/q_D \lesssim q_D/H_D \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} H_D^2/q_D^2$ and $H_D/q_D \max_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \tilde{h}_F^2/\tilde{p}_F^4 \lesssim q_D/H_D \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} H_D^4/q_D^4$ in going from (4.35) to (4.36). This is done because it is currently not possible to improve the last term in (4.35), as a consequence of the nonlocal form of the bounds in Theorems 5 and Theorem 6.

The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality with a parameter and the symmetry of the sum over i, j, $j \neq i$, imply that

$$\sum_{k=2}^{5} E_k \lesssim \sum_{\substack{i,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} \mu_F^{-1}\|\,D^2(v_h - v_H)\big|_{\Omega_i}\|_{L^2(F)}^2 + \mu_F\|\,\nabla(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_j}\|_{L^2(F)}^2. \tag{4.37}$$

Since $\mathcal{T}_S$ is conforming, each face F may appear at most twice in the above sum, and thus the trace and inverse inequalities imply that

$$\sum_{\substack{i,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} \mu_F^{-1}\|\,D^2(v_h - v_H)\big|_{\Omega_i}\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|v_h - v_H\|_{H^2(K)}^2 \lesssim \tilde{c}_0\, a_h(v_h, v_h). \tag{4.38}$$

Defining $\mu_D \coloneqq \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} p_K^2/h_K$, we apply Lemma 10 componentwise to the gradient of $v_h - v_H$ to find that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{i,j=1\\ i\neq j}}^{N} \sum_{\substack{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i\\ F\subset\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}} \mu_F\|\,\nabla(v_h - v_H)|_{\Omega_j}\|_{L^2(F)}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \mu_D\|\nabla(v_h - v_H)\|_{L^2(\partial D)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \mu_D\left[\frac{H_D}{q_D}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} |v_h - v_H|_{H^2(K)}^2 + \frac{H_D}{q_D}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h^i(D)} \frac{\tilde{p}_F^2}{\tilde{h}_F}\|[\![\nabla v_h]\!]\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \right.\\ &\qquad \left. + \frac{q_D}{H_D}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} |v_h - v_H|_{H^1(K)}^2\right].\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

It is important to observe that only terms involving interior faces of the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ appear on the right-hand side of the above inequality, so for each $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^i(D)$, we

have $\|[\![\nabla v_h]\!]\|^2_{L^2(F)} = \|[\![\nabla_{\mathrm{T}} v_h]\!]\|^2_{L^2(F)} + \|[\![\nabla v_h \cdot n_F]\!]\|^2_{L^2(F)}$. So, we deduce that

$$\sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \mu_D \|\nabla(v_h - v_H)\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)} \lesssim \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\mu_D \frac{H_D}{q_D}\right] \|v_h - v_H\|^2_{H^2(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\mu_D \frac{H_D}{q_D}\right] |v_h|^2_{\mathrm{J},h} + \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\mu_D \frac{q_D}{H_D}\right] \|v_h - v_H\|^2_{H^1(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)},$$

and thus Theorem 6 and coercivity of a_h show that

$$\sum_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \mu_D \|\nabla(v_h - v_H)\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)} \lesssim \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{q_D}{H_D} \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} \frac{p_K^2}{h_K}\right] \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_D^2}{q_D^2}\, a_h(v_h, v_h). \tag{4.40}$$

Therefore, the inequalities (4.37), (4.38) and (4.40) show that

$$\sum_{k=2}^{5} E_k \lesssim \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H}\left[\frac{q_D}{H_D} \max_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h(D)} \frac{p_K^2}{h_K}\right] \max_{D\in\mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_D^2}{q_D^2}\, a_h(v_h, v_h). \tag{4.41}$$

In summary, combining the inequalities (4.32), (4.36) and (4.41) implies that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N} a_h^i(I_i v_i, I_i v_i) \lesssim \tilde{c}_0\, a_h(v_h, v_h) + \sum_{k=1}^{5} E_k \lesssim \tilde{c}_0\, a_h(v_h, v_h), \tag{4.42}$$

which completes the proof of the stable decomposition property of Theorem 9. ∎

The proof of Theorem 9 completes the verification of Properties 1–3, and thus gives the bound (4.26) for the condition number of the preconditioned system.

5. Numerical experiments. In this section, we test the theoretical results of section 4 and investigate the performance and competitiveness of the preconditioners in practical applications. Direct factorizations were used to form the coarse mesh and local solvers.

5.1. First experiment. Since the bound (4.26) is the first to be explicit in both coarse and fine mesh polynomial degrees, it is important to ascertain its sharpness.

Let $\Omega = (0,1)^2$, and let the fixed meshes $\mathcal{T}_H = \mathcal{T}_S$ be obtained by a uniform subdivision of Ω into 4 squares, and let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be obtained by uniform subdivision of Ω into 16 squares. We consider the sequence of spaces $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ of piecewise polynomials on $\mathcal{T}_h$ with total degree p, where $p = 2, \ldots, 12$, and the coarse spaces $V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$ of piecewise polynomials on $\mathcal{T}_H$ with total degree q, where $q = 2, \ldots, 6$. We apply the additive Schwarz preconditioner defined in section 4 to the bilinear form a_h defined in (4.6), where the penalty parameters are defined by $c_\mu = c_\eta = 10$.

These choices are made to ensure that the resulting number of degrees of freedom is small, being at most equal to 1456 in the case of $p = 12$, thereby facilitating the accurate computation of the condition numbers $\kappa(\mathbf{P})$ of the preconditioned matrix $\mathbf{P}$. The resulting condition numbers are given in Table 1 and represented in Figure 1, which show that $\kappa(\mathbf{P})$ is of order $1 + p^6/q^3$, in agreement with the results of section 4 and in particular with the bound (4.28). This confirms that the predicted rates with respect to the polynomial degrees are optimal.

$\kappa(\mathbf{P})$	$q=2$	$q=3$	$q=4$	$q=5$	$q=6$	q rate
$p=2$	2.16×10^{1}					
$p=3$	3.34×10^{2}	6.71×10^{1}				
$p=4$	1.94×10^{3}	3.16×10^{2}	1.35×10^{2}			
$p=5$	7.22×10^{3}	1.43×10^{3}	4.11×10^{2}	2.10×10^{2}		
$p=6$	2.12×10^{4}	4.40×10^{3}	1.31×10^{3}	6.44×10^{2}	3.03×10^{2}	3.60
$p=7$	5.31×10^{4}	1.10×10^{4}	3.50×10^{3}	1.70×10^{3}	8.97×10^{2}	3.35
$p=8$	1.18×10^{5}	2.46×10^{4}	7.91×10^{3}	4.27×10^{3}	2.10×10^{3}	3.25
$p=9$	2.38×10^{5}	4.88×10^{4}	1.61×10^{4}	8.68×10^{3}	4.55×10^{3}	3.10
$p=10$	4.48×10^{5}	9.17×10^{4}	3.00×10^{4}	1.64×10^{4}	8.86×10^{3}	3.00
$p=11$	7.92×10^{5}	1.61×10^{5}	5.29×10^{4}	2.90×10^{4}	1.58×10^{4}	2.97
$p=12$	1.33×10^{6}	2.71×10^{5}	8.89×10^{4}	4.87×10^{4}	2.66×10^{4}	2.97
p rate	5.97	5.94	5.96	5.97	6.03	

Table 1: *Dependence of the condition number $\kappa(\mathbf{P})$ on the coarse and fine mesh polynomial degrees for experiment of section 5.1. The asymptotic rates are computed by regression on the last three entries of each column for p and each row for q. It is found that $\kappa(\mathbf{P})$ is of order $1+p^6/q^3$, as predicted in section 4.*



Fig. 1: *Dependence of the condition number $\kappa(\mathbf{P})$ on the coarse and fine mesh polynomial degrees for experiment of section 5.1. The condition numbers of Table 1 are plotted for representative degrees p and q.*

5.2. Second experiment. In this section, we compare the efficiency of nonoverlapping methods with the closely related overlapping methods. It is found the methods achieve similar performances in terms of iteration counts, although nonoverlapping methods are often faster as a result of lower computational costs.

Let $\Omega := (0,1)^2$, and let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be obtained by uniform subdivision of Ω into squares of size $h=2^{-k}$, $k=3,\ldots,8$. Let $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ consist of the space of polynomials of fixed partial degree $p=2$ on each element $K\in\mathcal{T}_h$. Consider the model problem (4.7), where the linear functional ℓ_h is chosen so that the solution u_h of (4.7) approximates the function $u(x,y) := \mathrm{e}^{xy}\sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)$; specifically, we define

$$\ell_h(v_h) := \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \Delta u, \Delta v_h\rangle_K \quad \forall\, v_h \in V_{h,\mathbf{p}}.$$



Fig. 2: *Overlapping and nonoverlapping decompositions of* $\Omega = (0,1)^2$ *used in the experiment of section 5.2. Four subdomains are used for both the overlapping and nonoverlapping methods, with the overlap size* δ *defined as the length shown above.*

Using the results of [15], it can then be shown that $\|u - u_h\|_{H^2(\Omega;\mathcal{T}_h)} \lesssim h^{p-1}$. The penalty parameters c_μ and c_η are chosen so that $\mu_F = 10/\tilde{h}_F$ and $\eta_F = 10/\tilde{h}_F^3$.

Overlapping domain decomposition. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$ and let Ω be divided into overlapping subdomains $\mathcal{T}_S = \{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^4$, as shown in the left-hand side diagram of Figure 2. This yields an overlapping decomposition of Ω with overlap δ; here, we use $\delta \in \{1/4, 1/8, 1/16\}$. Let $\mathcal{T}_H$ be a coarse mesh consisting of a uniform subdivision of Ω into 4 squares, thus yielding the ratios $H/\delta \in \{2,4,8\}$, and let $V_{H,\mathbf{q}}$ consist of the space of polynomials of fixed partial degree $q = 2$ on each element $D \in \mathcal{T}_H$. The local spaces $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}^i$ with associated solvers a_h^i, $1 \le i \le 4$, are defined analogously to the nonoverlapping case, described in section 4. The additive Schwarz preconditioner is also defined analogously to section 4.

Nonoverlapping domain decomposition. The domain Ω is partitioned into four subdomains $\mathcal{T}_S = \{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^4$, as shown in the right-hand side diagram of Figure 2. We consider three sequences of coarse meshes $\mathcal{T}_H$, also obtained by uniform subdivision of Ω into squares of size $H = 2^{-m}$, $m = 1, \ldots, k-1$, so that $H/h \in \{2,4,8\}$. The nonoverlapping additive Schwarz preconditioner is defined as in section 4.

Results. The implementations of the overlapping and nonoverlapping methods were the same, except for the required difference in handling the subdomains. Since the parallelizations of overlapping and nonoverlapping methods differ, our implementation was in serial in order to permit a more straightforward comparison.

Table 2 gives the number of iterations required to reduce the Euclidian norm of the residual by a factor of 10^{-6}. The results for both methods are comparable to those in the literature: see for instance [2, 4, 6, 12]. Table 2 also presents a representative sample of the CPU times required for the assembly of the preconditioner and the application of the preconditioned CG method. The assembly timing strictly includes the time spent on assembling and factorizing the coarse and local mesh solvers, whereas the solver time strictly includes the time spent on applying the preconditioned CG method. These timings are meant to provide a relative comparison of the methods, with better absolute timings achievable by parallelization.

For the same iteration count, the nonoverlapping methods are generally faster in both assembly and solution. This advantage in efficiency is essentially the result of the smaller dimension of the subdomain solvers. The nonoverlapping method is also generally cheaper in terms of memory costs. Our results show that both methods are efficient, with low iteration counts that remain bounded as H/δ or H/h is held fixed.

		Iteration count					
		Overlapping			Nonoverlapping		
DoF	h	$H = 2\delta$	$H = 4\delta$	$H = 8\delta$	$H = 2h$	$H = 4h$	$H = 8h$
144	1/4				20		
576	1/8	18			22	29	
2304	1/16	18	24		22	30	43
9216	1/32	18	25	37	20	32	52
36864	1/64	18	25	41	18	30	50
147456	1/128	18	26	41	17	27	48
589824	1/256	18	26	42	17	25	40

	Timing					
	Overlapping			Nonoverlapping		
$h = 1/128$	$H = 2\delta$	$H = 4\delta$	$H = 8\delta$	$H = 2h$	$H = 4h$	$H = 8h$
Assembly time	18.6s	14.5s	13.0s	14.0s	11.9s	11.6s
Solver time	8.39s	9.56s	13.3s	6.51s	8.62s	14.4s

Table 2: *Number of preconditioned CG iterations required to reduce the residual norm by a factor of* 10^{-6} *for overlapping and nonoverlapping methods, in the experiment of section 5.2, along with sample timings for assembly and timings of the preconditioned CG algorithm. The methods yield similar iteration counts for similar ratios of* H/δ *or* H/h*, but the nonoverlapping method is faster to assemble and apply, as a result of the smaller number of degrees of freedom in the local solvers. In practice, the best choice of preconditioner involves a tradeoff between iteration counts and computational costs.*

5.3. Third experiment. We will now consider applications of the preconditioning methods to problems of practical interest, namely fully nonlinear HJB equations. This introduces several challenges, such as nonsymmetric linear systems that appear in the semismooth Newton method. Nevertheless, it is found that nonoverlapping methods in particular remain robust and lead to efficient solvers for these problems.

The example presented here is closely related to the one from [16, Section 9.1]. Consider the boundary-value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} [L^\alpha u - f^\alpha] = 0 \quad &\text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \quad &\text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where $\Omega = (0,1)^2$, $\Lambda \coloneqq [0,\pi/3] \times \mathrm{SO}(2)$, and where $L^\alpha v \coloneqq a^\alpha \colon D^2 v$, with

$$a^\alpha \coloneqq \frac{1}{2} R \begin{pmatrix} 1+\sin^2\theta & \sin\theta\cos\theta \\ \sin\theta\cos\theta & \cos^2\theta \end{pmatrix} R^\top, \quad \alpha = (\theta, R) \in \Lambda. \tag{5.2}$$

The source terms f^α, $\alpha \in \Lambda$, are chosen so that the exact solution is given by $u(x,y) = \mathrm{e}^{xy}\sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)$, whilst yielding large variations in the values of α that attain the supremum in (5.1).

The numerical scheme (4.4) is applied on a sequence of fine meshes $\mathcal{T}_h$ obtained by uniform subdivision of Ω into squares of size $h = 2^{-k}$, $k = 3, \dots, 7$. Let $V_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ consist of the space of polynomials of fixed partial degree $p = 2$ on each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. To solve the nonlinear problem (4.4), we use the semismooth Newton method detailed in [16, Section 8]. It can be shown that each iteration of the semismooth Newton method leads to a nonsymmetric but positive definite linear system [16], which we solve using

		Average GMRES iterations (Newton steps)					
		Overlapping			Nonoverlapping		
DoF	h	$H = 2\delta$	$H = 4\delta$	$H = 8\delta$	$H = 2h$	$H = 4h$	$H = 8h$
144	1/4				18.3 (5)		
576	1/8	21.2 (5)			19.0 (5)	23.2 (5)	
2304	1/16	24.0 (5)	25.4 (5)		18.2 (5)	24.0 (5)	31.0 (5)
9216	1/32	28.5 (6)	29.7 (6)	38.2 (6)	19.0 (6)	24.5 (6)	35.2 (6)
36864	1/64	32.2 (6)	33.3 (6)	44.5 (6)	19.7 (6)	23.7 (6)	31.8 (6)
147456	1/128	34.2 (6)	35.3 (6)	48.7 (6)	20.0 (6)	23.2 (6)	29.8 (6)

Table 3: *Average number of left-preconditioned GMRES iterations per Newton step required to reduce the (preconditioned) residual by a factor of* 10^{-6}*, with total number of Newton steps in parentheses, for the problem of section 5.3. The iteration counts for the nonoverlapping methods remain low and bounded for fixed values of* H/h*.*

the left-preconditioned GMRES method, with the current approximate solution used as the starting guess. The preconditioners employed are the nonoverlapping and overlapping preconditioners from the experiment of section 5.2, and we emphasize that they are based on preconditioning the bilinear form a_h. It is important to observe that no additional factorizations are required between Newton steps, thus constituting a significant advantage in terms of efficiency.

As explained in [16], a key challenge in this example is that the diffusion coefficient a^α is highly anisotropic for θ near $\pi/3$, and the rotation matrices R may lead to large variations in the resulting diffusions across the domain and between Newton steps. As a result, we may expect significant anisotropic variations in the resulting linearizations encountered in the application of the semismooth Newton method. It is thus of interest to determine if the above preconditioners, based on the isotropic bilinear form a_h, remain robust in this context.

Table 3 gives the average number of GMRES iterations per Newton step required to reduce the Euclidian norm of the (preconditioned) residual by a factor of 10^{-6}, along with the total number of Newton steps required to achieve convergence, defined here as a step-increment L^2-norm below 10^{-6}. As in the case of section 5.2, the nonoverlapping methods are generally faster than the overlapping methods in terms of assembly and application.

These results show that nonoverlapping methods remain robust in face of the anisotropy, lack of symmetry and nonlinearity of the problem. We comment that right-preconditioning in the GMRES method yields similar results when used with an appropriate scaling of the unpreconditioned residual Euclidian norm. We thereby conclude that these preconditioning methods lead to effective solvers for these challenging problems.

6. Conclusion. Original approximation results for discontinuous finite element spaces enabled us to obtain an optimal order spectral bound for nonoverlapping domain decomposition preconditioners, the first for this class of methods that is explicit in the coarse mesh polynomial degree. We have shown the robustness, efficiency and competitiveness of these preconditioning methods in applications to symmetric and nonsymmetric problems in H^2-type norms, including fully nonlinear HJB equations.

REFERENCES

[1] R. A. Adams and J. F. Fournier, *Sobolev spaces*, vol. 140 of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Elsevier, second edition, 2003.

[2] P. F. Antonietti and B. Ayuso, *Schwarz domain decomposition preconditioners for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of elliptic problems: non-overlapping case*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 41 (2007), pp. 21–54.

[3] ———, *Multiplicative Schwarz methods for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of elliptic problems*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 42 (2008), pp. 443–469.

[4] P. F. Antonietti and P. Houston, *A class of domain decomposition preconditioners for hp-discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 46 (2011), pp. 124–149.

[5] P. F. Antonietti and E. Süli, *Domain decomposition preconditioning for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of convection-diffusion problems*, in Domain decomposition methods in science and engineering XVIII, vol. 70 of Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., Springer, Berlin, 2009, pp. 259–266.

[6] S. C. Brenner and K. Wang, *Two-level additive Schwarz preconditioners for C^0 interior penalty methods*, Numer. Math., 102 (2005), pp. 231–255.

[7] H. C. Elman, D. J. Silvester, and A. J. Wathen, *Finite elements and fast iterative solvers: with applications in incompressible fluid dynamics*, Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation, Oxford University Press, New York, 2005.

[8] X. Feng and O. A. Karakashian, *Two-level additive Schwarz methods for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second order elliptic problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 39 (2001), pp. 1343–1365 (electronic).

[9] ———, *Two-level non-overlapping Schwarz preconditioners for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of the biharmonic equation*, J. Sci. Comput., 22/23 (2005), pp. 289–314.

[10] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart, *Finite element methods for Navier-Stokes equations*, vol. 5 of Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.

[11] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, vol. 69 of Classics in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2011.

[12] C. Lasser and A. Toselli, *An overlapping domain decomposition preconditioner for a class of discontinuous Galerkin approximations of advection-diffusion problems*, Math. Comp., 72 (2003), pp. 1215–1238 (electronic).

[13] P. Monk and E. Süli, *The adaptive computation of far-field patterns by a posteriori error estimation of linear functionals*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 36 (1999), pp. 251–274.

[14] I. Mozolevski, E. Süli, and P. R. Bösing, *hp-version a priori error analysis of interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximations to the biharmonic equation*, J. Sci. Comput., 30 (2007), pp. 465–491.

[15] I. Smears and E. Süli, *Discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation of nondivergence form elliptic equations with Cordes coefficients*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 51 (2013), pp. 2088–2106.

[16] I. Smears and E. Süli, *Discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation of Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations with Cordes coefficients*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 52 (2014), pp. 993–1016.

[17] B. F. Smith, P. E. Bjørstad, and W. D. Gropp, *Domain decomposition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

[18] A. Toselli and O. Widlund, *Domain decomposition methods—algorithms and theory*, vol. 34 of Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.